



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/294,656	04/19/99	CUSSON	ORACLE01.001

GORDON E NELSON
57 CENTRAL ST
PO BOX 782
ROWLEY MA 01969

LMC1/0620

EXAMINER
HO, R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2771	

DATE MAILED: 06/20/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/294,565

Applicant(s)

Cusson et al.

Examiner

RUAY LIAN HO

Group Art Unit

2771



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Apr 19, 1999

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1035 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 2

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2771

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 250 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 250 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The phrases 'a preferred embodiment' and 'the preferred embodiment' should be avoided.

Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 2-5, 8-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claimed feature 'a probable future request' in claims 2-5, 10, 14-19 are not clear. Do applicants mean 'a probable future request based on the similarity ranking' or 'a probable future request based on criteria other than the similarity ranking' ?

The claimed feature 'the updater determines the information that is contained in the partial copy from the provision thereof by the server' is not clear. Do applicants mean 'the updater determines the information for retrieval' ?

Art Unit: 2771

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. Claims 1, 6-9, 20-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Draper et al. (USPN 5,924,096).

Regarding claim 1:

Each and every element of claim 1 is disclosed by Draper et al., note: the claimed 'a partial copy of the information belonging to the information source from which the server provides the information when the requested information is contained therein' is shown in col.2, 1.44-52,

the claimed 'an updater that updates the partial copy in response to update information which the information source provides the server when information in the partial copy is updated in the information source' is shown in col.2, 1.7-52.

Regarding claim 6:

Claim 6 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1.

Regarding claim 7:

The claimed 'the information source is a database system of the type wherein trigger code

Art Unit: 2771

may be associated with the information, the trigger code being executed when the information is updated' is shown in col.5, l.19-46,

the claimed 'the updater is trigger code which is associated with information contained in the partial copy, the trigger code responding to an update of the information by providing the update to the server' is shown in col.6, l.8-60.

Regarding claim 8:

Claim 8 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1.

Regarding claim 9:

Claim 9 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1.

Regarding claim 20:

Claim 20 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1.

Regarding claim 21:

The claimed 'HTML' and Web features are shown in col.9, l.33-53,

Claim 21 is also rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1.

Regarding claim 22:

The claimed 'global identifiers' and 'local identifiers' are shown in col.1, l.56 to col.2, l.6 & col.5, l.47-65 & col.6, l.8-48,

Claim 22 is also rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1.

Regarding claim 23:

Claim 23 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claims 1 and 21-22.

Art Unit: 2771

Regarding claim 24:

The claimed 'a program with a interface' is shown in col.9, l.33-53,

Claim 24 is also rejected for the similar rationale given for claims 1, 21.

Regarding claim 25:

Claim 25 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claims 21-22 and 24.

Regarding claim 26:

Claim 26 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claims 21-22 and 24.

Regarding claim 27:

Claim 27 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1.

Regarding claim 28:

Claim 28 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1.

Regarding claim 29:

Claim 29 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1.

Regarding claim 30:

Claim 30 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 7.

Regarding claim 31:

Claim 31 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 7.

Regarding claim 32:

Claim 32 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 7.

Regarding claim 33:

Art Unit: 2771

Claim 33 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claims 1 and 24.

Regarding claim 34:

Claim 34 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 24.

Regarding claim 35:


Claim 35 is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 25.

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ruay L. Ho whose telephone number is (703) 305-3834. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 10 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Yen Vu, can be reached on (703) 305-4393. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-9051 or (703) 308-5403.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.


RUAY LIAN HO
PRIMARY EXAMINER